

12 Aug 87

Surprises, w/ easy part of war:

Costing & cities of our war:

- such limited profit, so far.
- no accidental explosion, so far.
- no combat use, since Nagasaki, ad much commun., all recent
- even though we farms have been substituted (U.S. tanks, S.U. now).
FU is costly combat (U.S. tank, S.U. now).
- threats have retarded some policy, ad been despite the need, despite policy.
- O-1 planes, ad costly bombs, persist despite ultra-high-level policy.
(ad, production/deployment of nucs).
- no FS - ^{on} targets, fiber glass or otherwise, so far.
- Plan, ad real prospects, of ^{of we farms} limited war persist, despite policy): nuclear instability is not assumed

But see:
- crisis before
WWI;
- "no previous
failure in
challenge
program"
(though many
non-military
ad much commun.,
all recent)

Convers effects of encouraging the
public — and staffs — to fear
the "real possibility of a aggressive
atomic weapon attack" — as
defining the character of the SU,
an "adversary". (Kemmer's point, in 1949
document)

(with ^{SU} experts, all top officials,
knew ^{secretly} this fear was not
warranted).
at the ^{adversary} expression of SU, quite misleading.

Kemmer favoured ⁰⁾ CW — but ¹⁾ not with
nukes — and ²⁾ not roll-back; he did
not fear SU roll-back; but ³⁾ opposed
our build-ups. [and H-bomb?]

He did not over 1, 2, 3, 4 claim
= Mr. X article! nor (0) explicit in
these terms!

(He did justify CR = "classic" CW
terms! like NSC-68 (which disagreed on
1-4!)]